



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,935	03/07/2000	Tom Wucherer	M-8331-US	9780

7590 05/07/2003

Larry E Vierra Esq  
Vierra Magen Marcus Harmon & DeNiro LLP  
685 Market Street Suite 540  
San Francisco, CA 94105

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

AL HASHEMI, SANA A

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/519,935	WUCHERER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Sana Al-Hashemi	2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 32-64 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 32-64 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/2/2003 has been entered.

Claim 36 is objected to because (he) is missing a (t) Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 32-38, 40-50, 52-60, and 62-64, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US Patent No. 5,913,907), and further in view of Krause (US Patent No. 5,950206).

1. Regarding Claim 32, Davies discloses all the steps of managing distributed data, (see column 4, lines 19-23, Davies), with the exception that is the data is not explicitly applied to a

Art Unit: 2171

construction project. However, Krause discloses a method for managing the design and building of a construction project (see Fig. 5, Krause), the method being executable by a host computer system for processing and organizing building construction document and in particular, to an apparatus and method for searching, tracking and organizing building projects (see column 1, line 8- 12, Krause). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Davies invention to apply to construction projects as (see column 1, lines 8-25, Davies), as suggested by Krause. The motivation would have been to manage distributed data, expand the utility of the Davies system and thereby increase the usable market share. Also, the software needs to run on some type of platform.

receiving a first type of data for the construction project input by an application program of at least a first type via a first computer system to a central database (see Fig. 1, step 405, step 425, Davies)

receiving a second type of data for the construction project input by an application program of at least a second type via a second computer system to said central database (see Fig. 2, step 405, column 4, lines 26-28, Davies)(see column 3, lines 26-35, Krause);

generating a first message indicating a modification of the first data (see column 4, lines 1-8, Davies);

transmitting the first message to the second computer system (see column 6, lines 56-61, Davies).

2. Regarding Claim 33, the combined teaching of Davies and Krause disclose a method wherein receiving first type of data and receiving second data further comprises:

receiving said first and second data for storage into said central database via respective first and second interface databases (see Fig. 1, step 425, Davies).

3. Regarding Claim 34, Davies and Krause combination system discloses a method wherein the method further comprises the host computer system reading the first type of data stored in the first interface database and notifying the second computer prior to storing the read first type of data in the central database (see Fig. 8 step 804, Davies).

4. Regarding Claim 35, Davies and Krause combination system discloses a method wherein the method further comprises the host computer system monitoring the first interface database for predetermined changes to data stored therein, wherein the host computer system generates the first message in response to the host computer system detecting that the first data is stored in the first interface database (see Fig. 2, step 115, Davies).

5. Regarding Claim 36, Davies/ Krause disclose a method wherein the central database is in data communication with the host computer system, wherein the host computer system stores the first type of data in the central database in response to the host computer system detecting that the first type of data is stored in the first database (see Fig. 1, Davies).

6. Regarding Claims 37, 40, 50, 52, 54, 58- 60, and 62- 64, Davies/ Krause disclose a method wherein the first type of data comprises an object-oriented representation of a component of a construction project (see column 1, lines 8- 25, Krause).

7. Regarding Claims 38, and 49, Davies/ Krause discloses a method wherein the first or second type of application is computer aided design software (see column 1, lines 12-18, Krause).

Art Unit: 2171

8. Regarding Claims 41, 43, 44, 57, Davies discloses a method further including the steps of monitoring a plurality of transactions to the first interface database, wherein each of the plurality of transactions store data in the first interface database, wherein monitoring the plurality of transactions comprises comparing the plurality of transactions against a predetermined transaction;

detecting a match between one of the plurality of transactions to the first database and the predetermined transaction;

generating said first message wherein said first message indicates that first type of data has been stored in the first data base by the one of the plurality of transactions (see Fig 2, step 115, Davies);

transmitting the first message to the second computer system (see Fig. 8 step 804, column 6, lines 40-43, Davies).

9. Regarding Claim 42, Davies/ Krause discloses a method wherein further comprises:

reading the first type of data stored in the first database in response to the host computer detecting the match (see Fig. 1 step 405,Davies);

translating the first type of data into translated first data in response to the host computer detecting the match (see Fig 2, step 115, Davies);

storing the translated first type of data into another interface database in data communication with the host computer system in response to the host computer detecting the match (see Fig 2, step 405, Davies);

Art Unit: 2171

wherein the host computer system is configured to read the first data from the first interface database and the second data from the second interface database and store the first and second data in the central database (see Fig 2, step 100, Davies).

10. Regarding Claims 46, and 47, Davies/ Krause discloses a system wherein the host computer system is configured to monitor a plurality of transactions to a first database, wherein each of the plurality of transactions stores data in the first interface database (see Fig 1, Davies).

11. Regarding Claim 48, Davies/ Krause discloses a system wherein monitoring the plurality of transactions comprises comparing the plurality of transactions against a predetermined transaction (see Fig 6, Davies).

12. Regarding Claims 45, and 53, Davies/ Krause Discloses an apparatus comprising:  
a host computer system coupled to a network (see Fig 1, step 415);  
a central database of construction project objects in data communication with the host computer system (see Fig. 1, step 105, Davies);

first and second interface databases of project objects of at least a first and second types of application software, respectively, in data communication with the host computer system (see Fig 1, step 400, Davies);

first and second computer systems including at least said first and second types of application software, respectively, in data communication with the first and second interface databases, respectively (see fig. 1 step 405, Davies);

wherein the host computer system is configured to monitor a plurality of transactions to the first interface database, each of the plurality of transactions stores data in the first database, and monitoring the plurality of transactions comprises comparing the plurality of transactions

Art Unit: 2171

against a predetermined transaction; wherein the host computer system is configured to detect a match between one of the plurality of transactions to the first database and the predetermined transaction; wherein the host computer system is configured to generate a message indicating that the one of the plurality of transactions stored first data in the first database, wherein the host computer system generates the message in response to the host computer system detecting the match between the one of the plurality of transactions and the predetermined transaction; wherein the host computer system is configured to transmit the message to the second computer system in data communication with the host computer system (see column 1, lines 41-43, Davies).

13. Regarding Claim 55, Davies/ Krause discloses a method operating on a host computer system coupled to the Internet to manage the design and building of a construction project, comprising:

storing first data received from a first computer system in a database, wherein the first computer system operates at least a first type of application software and provides first data comprising construction project objects of a first type; generating a first message corresponding to a request to approve or reject storing the first data in the database (see Fig. 1 step 105, Davies);

transmitting the first message to a second computer system, wherein the second computer system is in data communication with the host computer system and the database and operates at least a second type of application software providing construction project objects of a second type (see Fig 8, step 804, Davies);

the second computer system generating a second message corresponding to an approval or rejection of storing the first data in the database (see Fig 8, step 804, Davies);

removing the first data from the database if the second message corresponds to the ejection of storing the first data in the second database, or maintaining the first data in the second database if the second message corresponds to the approval of storing the first data in the database (see column 3, lines 57-64, Davies).

14. Regarding Claim 56, Davies/ Krause discloses a method wherein the method further comprises the second computer transmitting the second message to the first computer system (see Fig 4, step 310, Davies).

Claims 39, 51, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US Patent No. 5,931,907) in view Krause as applied to claims above, and further in view of Burfield (US Patent No. 6,363,362).

15. Regarding Claims 39, 51, 61, Davies/Krause combination system does not disclose a method wherein the first or second type is accounting software. However, on the other hand Burfield discloses a method wherein the first or second type is accounting software (see column 3, lines 15-20, Burfield). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Davies/Krause combination system with Burfield' s software. The motivation would have been to expand the utility of the Davies system and thereby increase the usable market-share. Also, the software needs to run on some type of platform.

*Response to Amendment*

Art Unit: 2171

Applicant argues "receiving second type of data for the construction project input by an application program of at least a second type via a second computer system to a central database" Examiner disagrees. The combination for Davies and Krause does disclose the above-mentioned limitation, referring to column 3, lines 26-35. Attorney cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where as here the rejection are based on combination of references. In re Keller, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Applicant argues "'transmitting the first message to the second computer system' Davies reference fails to mention any message". Examiner disagrees. Referring to column 3, lines 60-64, Davies does disclose transmitting the first message to the second computer system.

### **Conclusion**

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

### **Points of Contact**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436. Any response to this office action should be mailed to: The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,

Art Unit: 2171

Washington, D.C. 20231. Or telefax at phone number (703) 746-9098. For formal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT". Hand-delivered response should be brought to

Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

---

Sana Al-Hashemi  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
April 24, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100